

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**LATASHA HILL**

**PLAINTIFF**

**V.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-CV-107-KS-BWR**

**AUTO CLUB FAMILY  
INSURANCE COMPANY, ET AL.**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Latasha Hill’s (“Hill”) Motion for Disqualification of District Judge Keith Starrett [84] under 28 U.S.C. § 144 and 28 U.S.C. § 455, Hill’s Memorandum [86] in Support of the Motion [84] and Hill’s Affidavit of Personal Knowledge [87]. Having considered the Motion [84], Memorandum [86], and Affidavit [87], the Court finds that the Motion [84] is not well-taken and is hereby denied.

Plaintiff Hill seeks recusal of the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), which provides that “[a]ny justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.” As a basis for the motion, Plaintiff Hill primarily cites proceedings in this case in which the undersigned has ruled against her.

“Adverse rulings alone do not call into question a district judge’s impartiality.” *Bryant v. Orndorff*, 196 F. App’x 308 (5th Cir. Aug. 28, 2006)(citing *Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540 (1994)). The Court has considered Hill’s arguments and finds that she has not sufficiently shown any reason for disqualification of the undersigned in this case. Accordingly, the Motion [84] is denied.

Because the Court has denied Hill’s Motion [84], Hill’s Emergency Motion for Random Reassignment [85] is hereby denied as moot.

SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED, this 24th day of July, 2025.

/s/Keith Starrett  
KEITH STARRETT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE